

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 12/07/2002

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P. SATHASIVAM

Writ Petition No.15730 of 1996 and Writ Petition No. 15731 of 1995
and Writ Petition No. 17246 of 1996

and

W.M.P.Nos. 24978, 24979/95, 1988/96, 23814 to 23816/96.

W.P.No. 15730 of 1995

C. Lakshmi Narain.

.. Petitioner.

Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its Commissioner
and Secretary, Transport Department,
Fort St. George, Madras-9.

2. The Transport Commissioner,
Ezhilagam, Madras-5.

3. V.S. Abdhul Ragim,

4. K. Rajendran

5. G. Panneerselvam,

6. R. Rajasekaran,

7. Tmt. M.R. Chandra,

8. M.V. Venu,

9. N. Raju,

10. P. Kesavelu,

11. P. Murugesan,

12. C. Babu,

13. K. Balachandar,

14. M. Elumalai,

15. R. Dhanasekar,

16. K.P. Samy,

17. R. Marimuthu,

18. C. Chinniah,

19. K. Narendrakumar,

20. V. Sekar,

21. S. Narayanan,

22. P.C. Johnson,

23. J. Antony,

24. S. Jayaaraman,

25. M. Kumar,

26. B. Ashok,
27. G. Rathna,
28. R. Muralidharan,
29. K. Nandagopal,
30. S. Yesudoss,
31. D. Kuppan,
32. K.M. Subramani
33. Auto and Taxi Drivers Union,
represented by its Secretary
S. Thangam.

(Respondents 3 to 32 impleaded as per
Order of Court dated. 22-11-95)
(Respondent No.33 impleaded as per
order of Court dated 21-12-95).
.. Respondents.

W.P.No. 15731 of 1995

C. Lakshmi Narain.
.. Petitioner.
Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its
Commissioner and Secretary,
Transport Department,
Fort St. George, Madras-9.

2. The Transport Commissioner,
Ezhilagam, Madras-5.
.. Respondents.

W.P.No. 17246 of 1996

C. Lakshmi Narain.
.. Petitioner.
Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its Commissioner
and Secretary, Transport Department,
Fort St. George, Madras-9.

2. The Transport Commissioner,
Ezhilagam, Madras-5.

3. The Commissioner of Police,
Police Commissioner's Office,
Egmore, Madras-8.

.. Respondents.

!For petitioner in all W.Ps: Mr. C. Lakshmi Narain
(Party in person).

^For respondents: Mr. R. Muthukumaraswamy,
Addl. Advocate General, assisted by Mr. S.
Kandasamy, Spl. Govt., Pleader for Respondents
1 and 2 in W.P.Nos. 15730, 15731/95 and for
Respondents 1 to 3 in W.P.No. 17246/96.

Mr. Kalyanaraman for R3 to R32 in W.P.15730/95.

Mr. S. Senthilnathan for R-33 in W.P.No.15730/95.

:COMMON ORDER

Since all these writ petitions have been filed by the very same petitioner and the subject matter is one and the same, they are being disposed of by the following common order. C. Lakshmi Narain, a practising Advocate of this Court and President of the Madras Auto Passengers' Association has filed all the three writ petitions. In W.P.No. 15730 of 95 the petitioner challenges G.O.Ms.No. 1651 Home (TR VI) dated 31-10-95 in and by which the Government has fixed the minimum charge as Rs.6-00 and Rs.3-00 per additional K.M. as fare for autorickshaws. In the same writ petition, he also seeks for a direction for appointment of an independent expert committee either by this Court or by the State Government to examine the proper fare increase for the autorickshaws in the city.

2. In Writ Petition No. 15731 of 1995 the petitioner seeks to issue a Writ of Declaration declaring Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 as violative of the Constitution of India in so far as it deprives citizens of the opportunity of making objections and a hearing before an independent authority or Commission in the matter of fixation of fares and freights under the motor Vehicles Act.

3. In Writ Petition No. 17246 of 1996 the very same petitioner challenges G.O.Ms.No. 1679 Home (TR VI) dated 5-11-96 in and by which the Government have increased the minimum fare as Rs.7/- and Rs.3-50 per K.M. for autorickshaws plying in the city. In the same writ petition, again he asked for a direction for appointment of an expert committee to examine proper fare increase for autorickshaws in the city and also seeks for a further direction to the respondents to make all meters in the autorickshaws tamper proof either by fixing electronic meters or such other devices and also issue direction to the respondents to investigate about the real ownership of the autos in the city.

4. The grievance of the petitioner is briefly stated hereunder: The petitioner is the President of Madras Auto Passengers' Association which, according to him, has been functioning for the benefit of auto passengers in

the city of Madras. By citing minimum auto fares in various other cities, namely, Hyderabad, Bangalore, Trivandrum and Bombay, it is stated that the rate fixed by the Government in 1995 as well as in 1996 is highly excessive and without considering the grievance of the public. The minimum fare and the rate fixed per K.M. is unreasonable and on the higher side causing untold hardship to the auto passengers in the city. It is also his case that though he represents Madras Auto Passengers' Association, he was not given adequate opportunity to put-forth the grievance of the auto passengers. It is also stated that instead of allowing the executive to fix the auto fares, either this Court or the State Government can appoint an independent expert body and fix the rate after consulting all the persons concerned.

5. Deputy Secretary to Government, Home Department, Secretariat, Madras-9 has filed a common counter affidavit in W.P.Nos. 15730 and 15731 of 95, wherein it is stated that the Government, after careful examination, have ordered for increase of fare for autorickshaw in G.O.Ms.No. 976, Home Department dated 30-6-95 from Rs.5/- to Rs.5.60 as minimum and from Rs.2.50 to Rs.2.80 per Kilo Metre. However, the autorickshaw drivers and operators agitated and went on one day strike demanding an increase of the fare to Rs.7.00 as minimum and Rs.3.50 per K.M. on the reason that the increase in autorickshaw fare is not corresponding to the increase in the cost of maintenance of the autorickshaw and to the cost of living in these days. The then Minister for Transport convened a meeting on 16-8-95 with the Associations of Drivers and owners of autorickshaws, representatives of Passengers Associations, Consumer Forums and other Welfare Associations connected with the public and opined that the increase of fare of autorickshaw may be considered at Rs.6.00 as minimum and Rs.3.00 per k.m. instead of Rs.7/- and Rs.3.50 respectively. Accordingly, the Government have revised the fare for autorickshaws in G.O.Ms.No. 1651, Home (Transport-VI) Department, dated 31-10-95, revising the minimum fare of autorickshaw at Rs.6/- and Rs.3/- per k.m. with effect from 15-11-95. In between 1993 and 1995, the fuel rates were increased two times. The drivers and owners of autorickshaws made a representation for fare increase. On receipt of the representation, the matter was placed before the committee and after notice to all the persons concerned, including the representative of Auto passengers and other social welfare organisations, the Government in G.O.Ms.No. 1679 the Government fixed the minimum or Rs.7/- and Rs.3-50 per k.m. While considering the revision of auto fare all aspects were taken into consideration, especially the increase in the cost of fuel, oil, spare parts, tyres, etc. and most of the participants except the petitioner, who attended the meeting agreed for the enhancement of auto fare and they have no objection for fixing the fare at Rs.7/- and Rs.3-50. The revision is ordered taking into account the interest of the drivers and the passengers. The views expressed by the various organisations were duly considered by the Government. Under Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, the State Government have powers to control and regulate road transport. The fare increase is only on the basis of representation made by the participants at the meeting held on 17-7-96. The Government in their wisdom issued orders and no single individual is involved in such a decision. Regarding the complaints against the auto drivers, they furnished the details regarding the steps taken by them during these periods.

6. During the pendency of the above writ petitions, in W.P.No. 15730/95, respondents 3 to 32 were impleaded as per the order of this Court dated 22-11-95 made in W.M.P.No. 25549/95. In the same writ petition, Auto Taxi Drivers Union through its Secretary was impleaded as respondent No.33 as per order dated 21-12-95 in W.M.P. No. 26049/95.

7. Before considering the claim of the petitioner and the stand taken by the Government, it is relevant to note that the petitioner in Writ Petition No. 15731/95, who is not only the President of Madras Auto Passengers Association, but also a practising Advocate, though challenges Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 which is a Central Act passed by the Parliament of India, for the reasons best known to him, has not chosen to implead the Union of India as one of the respondents. On this ground, the said writ petition is liable to be rejected. However, considering the claim made in the other writ petitions and taking note of the fact that Section 67 of the said Act has to be considered incidentally, I am inclined to consider the challenge made therein.

8. The following are the points raised by Mr. C. Lakshmi Narain:

(i) The rate fixed by the Government for autorickshaws plying in the city is unreasonable, arbitrary and highly excessive;

(ii) While considering the request of the drivers and owners of autorickshaws, the interest of the general public has not been considered;

(iii) Electronic and tamper proof meters must be fixed in all autorickshaws. The law enforcing authority-Police must take prompt action against the erring automen.

9. Learned Additional Advocate General, after tracing the history of power of the Government under the repealed Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 as well as Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, has raised the following contentions:

(i) Hearing of public objection etc., as provided under Section 43 of 1939 Act has been dispensed with in 1988 Act;

(ii) Even in the absence of such provision in the 1988 Act, on every occasion the Government issued notice to all the persons concerned and after considering their suggestion, grievance, etc., increased the fare for autorickshaws which is quite reasonable and acceptable;

(iii) Inasmuch as the Government considered the grievance of the drivers and owners of autorickshaws as well as the Association of general public and Social Organizations and in the light of the statutory provision, there is no substance in the claim made by the petitioner.

On direction, learned Additional Advocate General has placed the relevant file relating to the impugned Government Orders for perusal of this Court.

10. I have carefully considered the rival submissions.

11. It is not the case of the petitioner that the Government have no power to increase auto fare. His only grievance is that the increase should be reasonable and the Government must consider the grievance of the general public using autorickshaws. Learned Additional Advocate General, by drawing my attention to Section 43 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 and Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, would contend that there is a clear distinction between the old Act and the present 1988 Act. For instance, he points out that as per Section 43 of the 1939 Act, after public notice and after allowing such intervals of time, if any representations are made relating to the notification issued under sub-section (1), it is incumbent on the part of the State Government to consider the same. Those conditions have been removed in the 1988 Act. In spite of simplification of the procedure in the 1988 Act, learned Additional Advocate General has brought to my notice that the Government have constituted a High Level Committee and the Committee, after receiving representations from the drivers and owners of autorickshaws, issued notice to all the persons concerned, including the petitioner who is representing the Madras Auto Passengers' Association and other social Organizations. The file produced by the learned Additional Advocate General clearly shows the details such as notice of hearing intimated to members of Consumer Forum, representatives of Auto Owners' Association, Auto Drivers' Association and Madras Auto Passengers' Association. A perusal of the file also shows that on each occasion when the rate was increased in G.O.Ms.No. 1651 dated 31-10-95 and G.O.Ms.No. 1679 dated 5-11-96, about 38 to 40 Organizations attended the meetings and conveyed their views and suggestions. It is further seen that after considering all those aspects and the increase in the cost of fuel, oil, spare parts, tyres, etc., the Government agreed for the enhancement of the auto fare, but restricted it as a minimum of Rs.6/- and Rs.3/- per k.m. in G.O.Ms.No. 1651 dated 31-10-95 and Rs.7/- and Rs.3-50 per k.m. in G.O.Ms.No.1679 dated 5-11-96.

AUTO FARE

Minimum Per KM

Rs. NP Rs. NP

-- G.O.No.1111 dt.29-7-93 5-00 2-50

-- G.O.No.976 dt,30-06-95 5-60 2-80

WP.15730/95 G.O.1651 dt.31-10-95 6-00 3-00

WP.17236/96 G.O.1679 dt. 5-11-96 7-00 3-50

12. The above details and the particulars found in the file produced by the learned Additional Advocate General amply prove that on each and every occasion the Government have considered not only the grievance of drivers and owners of autorickshaws, but also the other various public bodies, Consumer Forums, Social Organizations, including Madras Auto Passengers Association in which the petitioner is the President. No doubt, Mr. Lakshmi Narain contended that he was not given sufficient time to attend and highlight his

grievance. However, as stated above, the file discloses that required opportunity was given to all the persons concerned and the Government increased the auto fare on both occasions after taking into consideration of the relevant factors, including the increase in the cost of fuel, spare parts, tyres, etc. As a matter of fact, the file also discloses that all the participants agreed for the minimum fare being fixed at Rs.6/- and Rs.3/- per k.m. Subsequent to the fixation of auto fare in G.O.Ms.No. 1651 dated 31-10-95, there was further steep increase in the oil price, accordingly after deliberation and consultation with the various Organizations, the Government have increased the minimum fare of autorickshaw at Rs.7/- and Rs.3-50 per k.m. In such a situation, the contrary claim made by the petitioner is liable to be rejected.

13. Mr. C. Lakshmi Narain, appearing in person by referring to decisions in (1) M.C. MEHTA v. UNION OF INDIA ((1997) 2 Supreme Court Cases 411); (2) GAURAV JAIN v. UNION OF INDIA ((1997) 8 Supreme Court Cases 114); (3) PRATUL KUMAR SINHA v. STATE OF ORISSA (AIR 1989 Supreme Court 1783); (4) STATE OF PUNJAB v. MOHINDER SINGH CHAWLA ((1997) 2 S.C.C.83); (5) DR ASHOK v. UNION OF INDIA ((1997) 5 S.C. C. 10); (6) A.S. MITTAL v. STATE of U.P (AIR 1989 SC 1570); (7) C. LAKSHMI NARAIN v. GOVERNMENT OF T.N. AND OTHERS (1999-3-L.W.516); (8) ALVARO v. GENERAL MANAGER, TELECOM (AIR 2000 Bombay 278); (9) STATE OF BIHAR v. RANCHI ZILA SAMTA PARTY (1997 1 MLJ 31); (10) LOK ADHIKAR SANGH V. STATE OF GUJARAT (AIR 2000 Gujarat 280); (11) V. LAKSHMIPATHY v. STATE (AIR 1992 Karnataka 57); (12) B. SAKARAMA SOMAYAJI v. ASSISTANT COMMISISONER, KUNDAPURA, D.K (AIR 1992 Karnataka 364); (13) DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION v. V. GNANARAJ (AIR 1992 Madras 124); (14) RAKESH CHANDRA v. STATE OF BIHAR (AIR 1989 S.C. 348); (15) KISHEN v. STATE OF ORISSA (AIR 1989 S.C. 677); (16) MRS. SELVAM v. CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT AND OTHERS (2002 (1) TLNJ 58); and (17) LAKSHMI NARAIN, C. v. GOVERNMENT OF T.N. (2001 Writ L.R. 565), would contend that this Court has ample power to issue appropriate direction. After going through the factual position and the ultimate conclusion arrived at in all these decisions, I am of the view that absolutely there is no dispute regarding the power of this Court to issue appropriate direction to safe guard the interest of public. However, as already referred to by me, the provision of Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 empowers the Government to increase or modify the rates not only for autorickshaws, but also for other stage carriages, contract carriages and public vehicles. It also prescribes the procedure to be followed while fixing the same. From the materials available, more particularly, the materials available in the file, I am satisfied that the Government have not only complied with section 67 of the Act, but also heard and considered all relevant factors and the grievance/suggestions of all the persons concerned; accordingly I hold that there is no substance in the claim made by the petitioner.

14. Regarding interference and power of this Court in matters like the present one, learned Additional Advocate General has relied on a Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in S. Narayan v. Union of India, reported in AIR 1976 Supreme Court 1986). The appellant before the Supreme Court is a retired District Manager (Telephones) and he filed a Writ Petition in this Court for a writ of prohibition directing the General Manager

(Telephones), Madras to forbear from enforcing the revised Telephone Tariff as per the Indian Telegraph Amendment Rules, 1966. Under the Rules, the rental and call charges were increased by 50 per cent and Trunk call charges by about 30 to 35 per cent. The petitioner alleged that the telephone system is a public utility service and not a Revenue earning establishment and the charges can be only in the nature of a fee which must be commensurate with the cost of rendering the service. After referring to the power of the Government of India under Indian Telegraph Act and after explaining the sequel of events that the question of rates was considered by the Tariff Enquiry Committee, that the tariff rates were placed before the House in the shape of Budget proposals, that the Parliament goes into all the Budget proposals and that are sanctioned by the Parliament, the Supreme Court held that the rates become a legislative policy as well as a legislative process, in the following manner: (para 7)

"7. The Courts have no jurisdiction under Article 226 to go into reasonableness of rates. These rates are decided as policy matter in fiscal planning. There is legislative prescription of rates. Rates are a matter for legislative judgment and not for judicial determination."

15. With regard to the contention that autorickshaw fare is comparatively less in other neighbouring cities, namely, Hyderabad, Bangalwore, Trivandrum etc., learned Additional Advocate General relied on another Constitutional Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in Anakapalle Co-op. Agricultural and Industrial Society v. Union of India, reported in AIR 1973 Supreme Court 734. The case relates to fixation of price of levy sugar in the different zones in the country under Levy Sugar Supply Control Order, 1972. Rejecting the contention regarding discrimination particularly adoption of zonal system etc., Their Lordships have held thus: (para 27)

"27???.We are unable to hold that while classifying zones on geographical - cum - agro-economic consideration, any discrimination was made or that the price fixation according to each zone taking into account all the relevant factors would give rise to such discrimination as would attract Art.14 of the Constitution."

16. Reliance is also placed on the decision of the Apex Court in Union of India v. Cynamide India Ltd., reported in AIR 1987 Supreme Court 1802, wherein Their Lordships have held that pricefixation is generally a legislative activity. They also held that price fixation is neither the function nor the forte of the Court. The Court is concerned neither with the policy nor with the rates. But the Court has jurisdiction to enquire into the question, in appropriate proceedings, whether relevant considerations have gone in and irrelevant considerations kept out of the determination of the price. They further held that the legislative action, plenary or subordinate, is not subject to rules of natural justice. In our case, I have already held that the Government had taken note of all relevant materials and heard all the persons concerned before passing the impugned orders.

17. In *M/s. Shri Sitaram Sugar Co., Ltd., v. Union of India*, reported in AIR 1990 Supreme Court 1277, the Supreme Court has held that orders fixing prices of levy sugar were duly published in the official gazettes notifying the prices determined for sugar of various grades and produced in various zones, and applicable to all producers of such sugar, and that such orders can be legitimately characterised as legislative. They further held that price fixation of levy sugar is in the nature of a legislative action even when it is based on objective criteria founded on relevant material. According to Their Lordships, no rule of natural justice is applicable to any such order. It is nevertheless imperative that the action of the authority should be inspired by reason and the Government cannot fix any arbitrary price.

18. In *O. and N.G. Commission v. Association of N.G. C. Industries of Gujarat*, reported in AIR 1990 Supreme Court 1851, the Supreme Court, while considering Oil and Natural Gas Commission Act (43 of 1959) and the Essential Commodities Act (10 of 1955) relating to price fixation of natural gas, held that it is for the Oil and Natural Gas Commission to fix the prices and there can be no requirement of a prior consultation with the present customers or with prospective customers. The Supreme Court further held that in such cases of price fixation, the only remedy of aggrieved consumers can perhaps be to have some sort of post-decisional reconsideration by the ONGC after hearing the view points of those affected.

19. Both these decisions clearly show that though the rule of natural justice is not applicable to the legislative action, it is nevertheless imperative that the action of the authority should be inspired by reason and that the Government cannot fix prices on extraneous considerations. In our case, I have already demonstrated that pursuant to the power conferred under Section 67 of the Act, the Government on receipt of representation from drivers and owners of autorickshaws, and after notice to all the persons concerned, including various Public/Social Organizations and Auto Passengers Association and after considering various factors such as increase in oil price, spare parts, tyres etc., increased the rate which cannot be said to be either arbitrary or unreasonable.

20. Mr. Lakshmi Narain has highlighted that there are number of instances of demanding higher amount by the auto drivers than the meter reading, and possessing defective meters in the autorickshaws. According to him, direction may be issued to the Government for fixation of electronic meters in all the autorickshaws. In this regard, in the counter affidavit filed by the Deputy Secretary to Government, Home (Transport) Department, it is stated that the Government are examining for fool proof method to curb the tendency of tampering the meters, by introducing electronic digital meters and there is no disinclination on the part of the department to enforce the rules. Regarding the request for fixing electronic meters in the vehicle, the Transport Commissioner, Madras-5 in his counter affidavit filed in W.P.No. 17246 of 96 has highlighted that,

"26??Tvl. Premier Instrument and Control Ltd., has come forward to supply the electronic meters for autorickshaws. On that basis during 1995, they have been asked to fix their electric meters in 10 autorickshaws on experimental

basis. After filling the same, all these meters fitted on the vehicle have been monitored daily for 10 days and found the meters did not work satisfactorily. Defects noted were (1) it requires a battery (2) whenever the vehicle is passing over a pit, automatically the meter deflects to other stage (3) during the daylight the readings shown by electric fare meter is not clearly visible and (4) non security for the meter in the vehicle, because of that they themselves accepts the above defects and they have assured to rectify these facts but they were not able to do so. Hence, the system of fixing the electric meter was dispensed with?"

These information would go to show that though the Transport Commissioner has made attempts to fix electronic meters, in view of unsatisfactory working condition of these meters, they were not able to continue the electronic meters in the autorickshaws.

21. Mr. Lakshmi Narain has also highlighted that the law enforcing authority-Police are not taking proper action against the autorickshaw drivers. Here again, it is relevant to refer the steps taken by the Police and the Authorities concerned during the relevant time. Both the Deputy Secretary to Government, Home (Transport) Department and the Transport Commissioner, Madras-5 in their counter affidavit have stated that after conducting so many checks and surprise checks from 1-1-95 to 31-8-95, 7804 check reports were issued to faulty autorickshaws out of which 763 autorickshaws were impounded for tampering of meters and 691 permits were suspended, 212 Driving Licence of auto drivers were suspended. These particulars amply prove that the police and the Authorities concerned were taking prompt steps then and there; accordingly I reject the claim made by the petitioner.

22. In the earlier part of my order, I have referred to the fact that in W.P.No. 15731/95 though the petitioner has prayed for declaration declaring Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 as unconstitutional, admittedly, he has not impleaded the Central Government as one of the respondents which enacted the Motor Vehicles Act. As a matter of fact, the petitioner appearing in person did not make any submission regarding the constitutionality of the said provision. In the absence of any material, after going through the relevant provision, namely, Section 67 of the Act, I do not find any merit in the claim made by the petitioner.

23. The following points emerge from the above discussion:

(i) Under Section 67 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, the State Government have power to increase/modify/vary fares and freights for all kinds of motor vehicles including autorickshaws by notification in the Gazette and also issue appropriate directions to the State Transport and Regional Transport Authorities;

(ii) Both the impugned orders i.e., G.O.Ms.No. 1651 Home (TR VI) dated 31-10-95 and G.O.Ms.No. 1679 Home (TR VI) dated 5-11-96 fixing fare for autorickshaws is valid, reasonable and in accordance with law.

(iii) Before taking a decision as to increase of fare for autorickshaws, it would be appropriate for the Government to issue Notice to all the persons concerned, particularly the Public/Social Organizations, who are directly connected with the use of transport, as well as the Auto Passengers' Association and consider their views/ suggestions.

(iv) Government may take sincere efforts in fixing Electronic tamper proof Meters or any other suitable Device in all Autorickshaws.

(v) The Law Enforcing Authority - Police must take prompt action against erring automen not only for violation of traffic rules, but also for collecting amount/rate over and above the rate fixed by the Government.

23. With the above observations, the Writ Petitions are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, all the miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Index:- Yes.

Internet:- Yes.

12-07-2002

R.B.

To:-

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu,
represented by its Commissioner
and Secretary, Transport Department,
Fort St. George, Madras-9.

2. The Transport Commissioner,
Ezhilagam, Madras-5.

3. The Commissioner of Police,
Police Commissioner's Office,
Egmore, Madras-8.
P. SATHASIVAM, J.

Common Order in W.P.Nos
15730, 15731/95 & 17246/96
and
WMP Nos. 24978, 24979/95,
1988/96, 23814 to 23816/96

□